5784751179

PAGE 02/03

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANTS:

Levy

SERIAL NO.:

10/723,271

GROUP ART UNIT: 1724

+4048156118

FILED:

November 26, 2003

EXAMMER:

Cintins

FOR:

WATER PURIFICATION APPARATUS AND SYSTEM

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 40654/283695

Commissioner for Patents P. O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

DATE: January 9, 2007

## DECLARATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.132

Sir:

## I, Ehud Levy, declare as follows:

- I am above the age of 21 years and am competent to make this declaration. 1.
- I am the named inventor of the above-identified patent application. 2.
- I have read and understood the Office action issued in the above-identified patent 3. application dated November 8, 2006 and the references cited therein.
- In order to further illustrate the non-obvious nature of the invention claimed in the 4. above-mentioned patent application, the following experiments were carried out by me or at my direction by individuals under my control.
- In Experiment 1 and Comparative Experiment 1 described in more detail below, the 5. same water supply (Atlanta city water), cartridge design, and test rig were used, and the same 60 second on/off cycle and NSF turbidity test method was employed.

US2000 9007536,1

01/09/2007 15:16

6784751179

RA

PAGE 01/03

- The results show that when activated char is used, moderate turbidity is initially 8. observed, but that this rapidly clears, and remains clear, over a long period of time. By contrast, when activated carbon powder is used, initial turbidity is much higher than with activated char, and the turbidity remains high over a significant number of cycles. In addition, after 671 cycles, the activated carbon powder had lost 13.2 % of its starting mass. This difference is significant because increased turbidity leads to decreased consumer acceptance of the filtration system, and can indicate an increased health risk. The difference in result is unexpected.
- 9. All statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issued thereon.